

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 PREDRAG TOSIC,

CASE NO. C23-0619JLR

11 Plaintiff,

ORDER

12 v.

13 HEATHER BLAKEMORE-
14 TOMASON,

Defendant.

15 Before the court is Plaintiff Predrag Tasic's motion for clarification regarding
16 "minute orders and some other procedural matters." (Mot. (Dkt. # 13).) The court has
17 reviewed Mr. Tasic's request and, for the reasons stated herein, DENIES it.
18

19 In his motion, Mr. Tasic ostensibly responds to the court's April 28, 2023 Minute
20 Order ordering Mr. Tasic to cure certain filing deficiencies. (*See* 4/28/23 Min. Order
21 (Dkt. # 3) (ordering Mr. Tasic to file a copy of the operative complaint).) Mr. Tasic asks
22

1 the court to clarify which of his state court pleadings is the operative complaint and poses
 2 a litany of other procedural and legal questions regarding his case. (*See generally* Mot.)

3 The court, however, cannot give legal advice to *pro se* parties, except to
 4 recommend they seek the advice of a trained attorney. The United States Supreme Court
 5 has concluded that “[d]istrict judges have no obligation to act as counsel or paralegal to
 6 *pro se* litigants,” because requiring federal district judges to explain the details of federal
 7 procedure or act as a *pro se* litigant’s counsel “would undermine district judges’ role as
 8 impartial decisionmakers.” *Pliler v. Ford*, 542 U.S. 225, 231 (2004); *see also Jacobsen*
 9 *v. Filler*, 790 F.2d 1362, 1365-66 (9th Cir. 1986) (noting that advising *pro se* litigants
 10 would make the court “a player in the adversary process rather than remaining its
 11 referee”).¹

12 The court therefore DENIES Mr. Tasic’s motion for clarification (Dkt. # 13) and
 13 recommends that Mr. Tasic seek the advice of a trained attorney and review this
 14 District’s Pro Se Guide. *See* W.D. Wash., *Pro Se Guide to Filing Your Lawsuit in*
 15 *Federal Court* (rev’d April 2023),
 16 <https://www.wawd.uscourts.gov/sites/wawd/files/ProSeGuidetoFilingYourLawsuitinFederalCourt.pdf>.

20 ¹ *See also, e.g., United States ex rel. Dahlstrom v. Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe of Wash.*,
 21 No. C16-0052JLR, 2020 WL 949940 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 27, 2020) (denying *pro se* party’s
 22 request for legal advice); *Ellenwood v. Dep’t of Corr. Mental/Medical Health*, No.
 C08-5197FDB, 2008 WL 2323926, at *2 (W.D. Wash. June 5, 2008) (same); *Hopper v. Wigen*,
 No. C05-5662FDB, 2006 WL 166360, at *1 n.1 (W.D. Wash. June 9, 2006) (same).

1 Dated this 10th day of May, 2023.

2
3
4



5 JAMES L. ROBART
6 United States District Judge
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22